

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appl. No.:	10/728,683	§	Confirmation No.:	9079
Applicant:	Michael J. Gauer	§		
Filed:	12/05/2003	§		
TC/A.U.:	2625	§		
Examiner:	Ashish Thomas	§		
Title:	PRINTED DOCUMENT	§		
	IDENTIFICATION	§		
Docket No.:	200901536-1	§		
	(HPC.0870US)	§		
		§		

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPEAL BRIEF PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R § 41.37

Sir:

The final rejection of claims 2-13, 15-20, 22-28, and 31-38 is hereby appealed.

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is the Hewlett-Packard Development Company, LP. The Hewlett-Packard Development Company, LP, a limited partnership established under the laws of the State of Texas and having a principal place of business at 11445 Compaq Center Drive West, Houston, TX 77070, U.S.A. (hereinafter "HPDC"). HPDC is a Texas limited partnership and is a wholly-owned affiliate of Hewlett-Packard Company, a Delaware Corporation, headquartered in Palo Alto, CA. The general or managing partner of HPDC is HPQ Holdings, LLC.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

None.

III. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 2-13, 15-20, 22-28, and 31-38 have been finally rejected and are the subject of this appeal. Claims 1, 14, 21, and 29-30 have been cancelled.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendment after the final rejection of October 7, 2009 has been submitted. Therefore, all amendments have been entered.

V. SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The following provides a concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims involved in the appeal, referring to the specification by page and line number and to the drawings by reference characters, as required by 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(v). Each element of the claims is identified by a corresponding reference to the specification and drawings where applicable. Note that the citation to passages in the specification and drawings for each claim element does not imply that the limitations from the specification and drawings should be read into the corresponding claim element. Note also that the cited passages are provided as examples, as other passages in the specification or drawings not cited may also be relevant to the corresponding claim elements.

Independent claim 7 recites a computer-implemented method for printing a document, the method comprising:

receiving (Fig. 3:302) document data (Fig. 1:102) from an application (Fig. 1:108; Spec., p. 3, ln. 24-29), the document data comprising data for printing at least a portion of the document (Spec., p. 4, ln. 3-14; p. 8, ln. 15-20);

accessing (Fig. 3:304) information (Fig. 2:202) associated with a sender of the document data (Spec., p. 7, ln. 27-30; p. 8, ln. 21-23); and

formatting (Fig. 3:306) a page to be printed such that the page comprises at least a portion of the received document data and the accessed information, and the accessed information is located outside document data areas (Fig. 2:204) and inside printer allowable margins (Spec., p. 7, ln. 11-26; Fig. 2:206; p. 8, ln. 23-30),

wherein formatting the page to be printed comprises checking (Fig. 3:308) whether the accessed information for the formatted page fits between the document data areas and the printer allowable margins (Spec., p. 8, ln. 30 – p. 9, ln. 7).

Independent claim 20 recites a system (Fig. 1:100; Spec., p. 3:22) comprising:

an apparatus comprising:

a memory (Spec., p. 4, ln. 25-30; Fig. 1:110), wherein the memory is operable to store document data (Fig. 1:102) from an application, the document data comprising data for printing at least a portion of the document (Spec., p. 4, ln. 3-14; p. 8, ln. 15-20); and

a processor (Spec., p. 4, ln. 21-23; p. 4, ln. 30 – p. 5, ln. 5; Fig. 1:110) coupled to the memory, the processor operable to:

access (Fig. 3:304) information associated with a sender of the document data (Spec., p. 7, ln. 27-30; p. 8, ln. 21-23), and

format (Fig. 3:306) a page to be printed such that the page comprises at least a portion of the document data and the accessed information, and the accessed information is located outside document data areas (Fig. 2:204) and inside printer allowable margins (Spec., p. 7, ln. 11-26; Fig. 2:206; p. 8, ln. 23-30),

wherein formatting the page to be printed comprises checking (Fig. 3:308) whether the accessed information for the formatted page fits between the document data areas and the printer allowable margins (Spec., p. 8, ln. 30 – p. 9, ln. 7).

Independent claim 24 recites an article of manufacture comprising a machine-readable medium that stores instructions operable to cause one or more machines to perform operations comprising:

determining whether document data (Fig. 1:102) from an application has been received (Fig. 3:302), the document data comprising data for printing at least a portion of the document (Spec., p. 4, ln. 3-14; p. 8, ln. 15-20);

accessing (Fig. 3:304) information (Fig. 2:202) associated with a sender of the document data (Spec., p. 7, ln. 27-30; p. 8, ln. 21-23); and

formatting (Fig. 3:306) a page to be printed such that the page comprises at least a portion of the received document data and the accessed information, and the accessed information is located outside document data areas (Fig. 2:204) and inside printer allowable margins (Spec., p. 7, ln. 11-26; Fig. 2:206; p. 8, ln. 23-30),

wherein formatting the page to be printed comprises checking (Fig. 3:308) whether the accessed information for the formatted page fits between the document data areas and the printer allowable margins (Spec., p. 8, ln. 30 – p. 9, ln. 7).

Independent claim 33 recites a computer-implemented method for printing a document, the method comprising:

receiving (Fig. 3:302) document data (Fig. 1:102) from an application (Fig. 1:108; Spec., p. 3, ln. 24-29) that facilitates displaying and editing the document, the document data comprising data for printing at least a portion of the document (Spec., p. 4, ln. 3-14; p. 8, ln. 15-20);

determining an identifier (Fig. 2:202) associated with a sender of the document data (Spec., p. 7, ln. 27-30; p. 8, ln. 21-23);

accessing (Fig. 3:304) information (Fig. 2:202) associated with the sender identifier, including querying a database comprising sender associated information (Spec., p. 7, ln. 27-30; p. 8, ln. 21-23);

formatting (Fig. 3:306) a page to be printed such that the page comprises at least a portion of the received document data and the accessed information, and the accessed information is located outside document data areas (Fig. 2:204) and inside printer allowable margins (Spec., p. 7, ln. 11-26; Fig. 2:206; p. 8, ln. 23-30);

checking (Fig. 3:308) whether the accessed information for the formatted page fits between the document data areas and the printer allowable margins (Spec., p. 8, ln. 30 – p. 9, ln. 7);

initiating (Fig. 3:310) an alert if the accessed information for the formatted page does not fit between the document data areas and the printer allowable margins (Spec., p. 9, ln. 8-11);

generating (Fig. 3:314) a user interface that allows formatting of content, location, orientation, and appearance of information associated with a sender (Spec., p. 9, ln. 16-18); and

generating (Fig. 3:316) a printer message comprising the formatted page (Spec., p. 9, ln. 21-23).

Claim 31, set forth below, includes means plus function elements, which are identified as required by 37 C.F.R. § 41.37. For each means plus function element, the structure, material, or acts described in the Specification as corresponding to each claimed function is set forth by reference to page and line number, and to the drawings, by reference characters. Although claims 32 and 37 do not recite means-plus-function elements, they depend from a base claim that recites means-plus-function elements.

Independent claim 31 recites a system comprising:

memory (Fig. 1:110; Spec., p. 4, ln. 25-30) for storing document data received from an application (Fig. 1:108; Spec., p. 3, ln. 24-29), the document data comprising data for printing at least a portion of the document (Spec., p. 4, ln. 3-14; p. 8, ln. 15-20), and

means (Fig. 1:110; Spec., p. 4, ln. 21-23; ln. 30 – p. 5, ln. 5) for accessing (Fig. 3:304) information (Fig. 2:202) associated with a sender of the document data (Spec., p. 7, ln. 27-30; p. 8, ln. 21-23), and formatting (Fig. 3:306) a page to be printed such that the page comprises at least a portion of the document data and the accessed information, and the accessed information is located outside document data areas (Fig. 2:204) and inside printer allowable margins (Spec., p. 7, ln. 11-26; Fig. 2:206; p. 8, ln. 23-30),

wherein formatting the page to be printed comprises checking (Fig. 3:308) whether the accessed information for the formatted page fits between the document data areas and the printer allowable margins (Spec., p. 8, ln. 30 – p. 9, ln. 7).

Claim 32 recites the system of claim 31 wherein formatting the page to be printed comprises initiating (Fig. 3:310) an alert if the accessed information for the formatted page does not fit between the document data areas and the printer allowable margins (Spec., p. 9, ln. 8-9).

Claim 37 recites the system of claim 31, wherein the application (Fig. 1:108) facilitates displaying and editing the document (Spec., p. 3, ln. 28-29).

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

- A. Claims 7-13, 15-17, 20, 24-28, 31, 32, and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Brewster (U.S. Patent No. 6,809,841) in view of Johnson (U.S. Patent No. 5,930,350) and further in view of Phang (U.S. Patent No. 6,437,876).**
- B. Claims 2-6, 18, 19, 22, 23, and 34-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Brewster in view of Johnson, Phang and Masaki (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0051206).**
- C. Claim 33 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Brewster in view of Johnson, Masaki and Phang.**

VII. ARGUMENT

The claims do not stand or fall together. Instead, Appellant presents separate arguments for various independent and dependent claims. Each of these arguments is separately argued below and presented with separate headings and sub-headings as required by 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vii).

- A. Claims 7-13, 15-17, 20, 24-28, 31, 32, and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Brewster (U.S. Patent No. 6,809,841) in view of Johnson (U.S. Patent No. 5,930,350) and further in view of Phang (U.S. Patent No. 6,437,876).**

- 1. Claims 7, 10-13, 24, 27, 28, 31, 38.**

It is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of claim 7 over Brewster, Johnson, and Phang is defective.

To make a determination under 35 U.S.C. § 103, several basic factual inquiries must be performed, including determining the scope and content of the prior art, and ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue. *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17, 148 U.S.P.Q. 459 (1965). Moreover, as held by the U.S. Supreme Court, it is important to identify a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine

reference teachings in the manner that the claimed invention does. *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1741, 82 U.S.P.Q.2d 1385 (2007).

Here, Phang fails to disclose or hint at the subject matter asserted by the Examiner to be taught by Phang (and conceded by the Examiner to be missing from Brewster and Johnson). The Examiner cited column 1, lines 55-65, of Phang as purportedly disclosing the following:

wherein formatting a page to be printed comprises **checking** whether the accessed information for the formatted page **fits** between the document data areas and the printer allowable margins.

10/7/2009 Office Action at 5. Column 1 of Phang refers to a work area on a page that is specified by a set of left, right, top and bottom margins. Phang, 1:40-41. Phang explains that a user can select these margins by specifying the distance of these margins from respective edges of a medium. *Id.*, 1:41-43. Phang also explains that in applications that allow extra information such as headers, footers, or line numbers to be included, the work area in such applications “is defined to cover the full extent of all the extra information added to a page.” *Id.*, 1:43-50. Phang states that if the work area falls within the printable area of the medium, the work produced in the work area can be printed completely on the medium. *Id.*, 1:50-52. However, Phang states that if the work area encroaches on the unprintable area, the part of the work which lies in the unprintable area will not be printed. *Id.*, 1:52-53.

Thus, according to Phang, an application verifies “user-selected margins with the reported boundaries [reported from a printer].” *Id.*, 1:62-64. In Phang, the checking that is performed is checking whether user-selected margins encroach and pass a boundary into an unprintable area of a medium. Determining whether user-selected margins exceeds a boundary that defines a printable area of a printer, as taught by Phang, is not the same as “checking

whether the accessed information [associated with a sender of document data] for the formatted page fits between the document data areas and the printer margins,” as recited in claim 7.

In fact, Phang assumes that extra information such as headers, footers, and line numbers are included within the work area defined by the user-selected margins. Thus, Phang would have absolutely no desirability or need to check whether accessed information associated with a sender of document data can fit between document data areas and print allowable margins, since what Phang does is to check whether the entire work area as defined by user-selected margins are within printer boundaries, which is fundamentally quite different from the subject matter of claim 7.

The Response to Arguments section of the 10/7/2009 Office Action argued that “the Phang reference was incorporated in the rejection to simply teach the ability to determine if the data is within a set boundary” 10/7/2009 Office Action at 2. The Examiner then goes on to state, “[a]fter looking at Phang, one of ordinary skill in the art can make some obvious changes.” The Examiner argued that “[o]ne such obvious change could [reasonably] be the ability to alter the boundaries or the ability to define the data within the boundaries.” *Id.*

The “obvious change” noted by the Examiner that one could alter the boundaries or define data within the boundaries, still does not lead to the claimed subject matter. As noted above, the checking that is performed in Phang is checking whether user-selected margins encroach and pass a boundary into an unprintable area of a medium. However, this checking is completely different from formatting the page to be printed that includes **checking** whether the accessed information [associated with a sender of the document data] for the formatted page **fits between the document data areas and the printer allowable margins.**

Although the Examiner argued that the Examiner's rationale conforms to the reasoning set forth in *KSR* relating to obviousness, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has actually used impermissible hindsight to propose a modification of the teachings of the cited references to achieve the claimed subject matter. *See Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. at 36 (cautioning against slipping into use of hindsight and "to resist the temptation to read into the prior art the teachings of the invention in issue.").

The Examiner further argued that the basis for making the proposed changes is that it would be obvious to apply "a known technology to a known device (method, or product) ready for improvement to yield predictable results." 10/7/2009 Office Action at 2. However, it is clear that checking whether the accessed information associated with a sender of document data for the formatted page fits between the document data areas and printer margins, as claimed, is not a "known technology" that can be applied to a known device ready for improvement to yield predictable results. Phang is clearly silent on checking whether accessed information fits **between** document data areas and printer allowable margins. Phang merely discloses checking whether user-selected margins encroach and pass a boundary into an unprintable area of a medium.

Therefore, even if Brewster, Johnson, and Phang could be hypothetically combined, the hypothetical combination of the references would not have led to the claimed subject matter.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that a person of ordinary skill in the art would not have been prompted to combine these reference teachings, since the cited references disclose subject matter that are fundamentally different from the subject matter of claim 7. Phang would have taught a person of ordinary skill in the art to define a work area within user-selected margins, and then check whether such user-selected margins fit within printer boundaries. On

the other hand, the subject matter of claim 7 relates to performing a different type of check, namely checking whether accessed information associated with a sender of document data fits between document data areas and printer allowable margins. Phang would not have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Brewster, Johnson, and Phang to achieve the claimed subject matter.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of claim 7 and its dependent claims is erroneous.

Independent claims 24 and 31, and their respective dependent claims, are allowable for similar reasons as claim 7.

Reversal of the final rejection of the above claims is respectfully requested.

2. Claims 15-17, 20.

Independent claim 20 is non-obvious over Brewster, Johnson, and Phang for similar reasons as stated above with respect to claim 7. More specifically, the hypothetical combination of Brewster, Johnson, and Phang fails to disclose or hint at the following subject matter of claim 20:

wherein formatting the page to be printed comprises checking whether the accessed information for the formatted page fits between the document data areas and the printer allowable margins.

Moreover, for reasons as stated above with respect to claim 7, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not have been prompted to combine the teachings of Brewster, Johnson, and Phang to achieve the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the obviousness rejection of claim 20 and its dependent claims is erroneous.

Reversal of the final rejection of the above claims is respectfully requested.

3. Claims 8, 9, 25, 26, 32.

Claims 8, 9, 25, 26, and 32 depend respectively from base claims 7, 24, and 31, and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as corresponding base claims. Moreover, claim 8 further recites initiating an alert if the accessed information for the formatted page does not **fit between the document data areas and the printer allowable margins**. As purportedly disclosing the foregoing claimed feature, the Examiner cited column 1, line 64-67, of Phang. 10/7/2009 Office Action at 11. The cited column 1 passage of Phang states that a boundary-exceeded warning is presented if the user-selected margins are outside of the boundaries of printer-supported media. However, such boundary-exceeded warning is not initiated if the accessed information associated with a sender of the document data does not **fit between the document data areas and the printer allowable margins**. The concept of determining whether access information fits between document data areas and printer allowable margins clearly is not present in Phang, and therefore, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not have been led by Phang to the subject matter of claim 8.

In view of the foregoing, claim 8 and its dependent claim 9 are non-obvious over the cited references.

Claims 25, 26, and 32 are similarly further allowable over the cited references.

Reversal of the final rejection of the above claims is respectfully requested.

B. Claims 2-6, 18, 19, 22, 23, and 34-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Brewster in view of Johnson, Phang and Masaki (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0051206).

1. Claims 2-6, 22.

Claims 2-6, and 22 depend respectively from base claims 8 and 25. Therefore, in view of the allowability of those base claims over Brewster, Johnson, and Phang, it is respectfully

submitted that the obviousness rejection of the foregoing claims over Brewster, Johnson, Phang, and Masaki has been overcome.

Reversal of the final rejection of the above claims is respectfully requested.

2. Claims 18, 19, 23, 34-37.

In view of the allowability of base claims 7, 20, 24, and 31 over Brewster, Johnson, and Phang, the obviousness rejection of dependent claims over Brewster, Johnson, Phang, and Masaki has been overcome.

Reversal of the final rejection of the above claims is respectfully requested.

C. Claim 33 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Brewster in view of Johnson, Masaki and Phang.

1. Claim 33.

Independent claim 33 was rejected as purportedly obvious over Brewster, Johnson, Masaki, and Phang. With respect to claim 33, the Office Action conceded that Brewster, Johnson, and Masaki fail to disclose checking whether the formatted page fits between the document data areas and printer allowable margins. 10/7/2009 Office Action at 17-18. Instead, the Examiner relied upon Phang as purportedly disclosing the above claimed subject matter. However, as explained above in connection with claim 7, Phang fails to disclose or hint at this subject matter.

Claim 33 further recites initiating an alert if the accessed information for the formatted page does not fit **between the document data areas and the printer allowable margins**. As discussed above in connection with claim 8, Phang also fails to provide any teaching or hint of initiating an alert if the accessed information does not fit **between the document data areas and the printer allowable margins**.

Therefore, claim 33 is non-obvious over Brewster, Johnson, Masaki, and Phang.

Reversal of the final rejection of the above claim is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, reversal of all final rejections and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 3, 2010

/Dan C. Hu/

Dan C. Hu
Registration No. 40,025
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
Telephone: (713) 468-8880
Facsimile: (713) 468-8883

VIII. APPENDIX OF APPEALED CLAIMS

The claims on appeal are (claims 1, 14, 21, and 29-30 have been cancelled):

1 2. The method of claim 8 further comprising:
2 receiving a request to format the information associated with the sender of document
3 data, wherein the request is responsive to the alert; and
4 generating a user interface that allows formatting of the information associated with the
5 sender of document data.

1 3. The method of claim 2 wherein the user interface allows specification of an
2 orientation in which the information associated with the sender of document data is placed on the
3 page, wherein the orientation is selectable from one of plural possible orientations.

1 4. The method of claim 2 wherein the user interface allows specification of the
2 information associated with the sender of document data.

1 5. The method of claim 2 wherein the user interface allows specification of a
2 presentation style of the information associated with a sender of document data.

1 6. The method of claim 2 wherein the user interface allows specification of a
2 location of the information associated with the sender of document data.

1 7. A computer-implemented method for printing a document, the method
2 comprising:
3 receiving document data from an application, the document data comprising data for
4 printing at least a portion of the document;
5 accessing information associated with a sender of the document data; and
6 formatting a page to be printed such that the page comprises at least a portion of the
7 received document data and the accessed information, and the accessed information is located
8 outside document data areas and inside printer allowable margins,
9 wherein formatting the page to be printed comprises checking whether the accessed
10 information for the formatted page fits between the document data areas and the printer
11 allowable margins.

1 8. The method of claim 7 further comprising initiating an alert if the accessed
2 information for the formatted page does not fit between the document data areas and the printer
3 allowable margins.

1 9. The method of claim 8 further comprising allowing the format of the accessed
2 information to be changed if the alert is initiated.

1 10. The method of claim 7 further comprising associating the received document data
2 with the sender of the document data.

1 11. The method of claim 10 wherein associating the received document data with the
2 sender of the document data comprises determining a sender identifier accompanying the
3 document data.

1 12. The method of claim 7 wherein accessing information associated with the sender
2 of the document data comprises querying a database comprising sender associated information.

1 13. The method of claim 7 further comprising generating a printer message
2 comprising the formatted page.

1 15. The system of claim 20 wherein the document data includes data relating to
2 appearance and content of a document.

1 16. The system of claim 20 wherein the processor is further operable to format the
2 document data in relation with formatting requirements associated with a printer.

1 17. The system of claim 20 wherein the apparatus comprises a printer driver.

1 18. The system of claim 20 wherein the processor is further operable to:
2 receive a request to format the information associated with the sender of document data,
3 wherein the request is responsive to an alert received indicating that the accessed informatin does
4 not fit between the document data areas and the printer allowable margins; and
5 generate a user interface that allows formatting of the information associated with the
6 sender of document data.

1 19. The system of claim 18 wherein the user interface allows specification of the
2 content and appearance of the information associated with the sender of document data.

1 20. A system comprising:
2 an apparatus comprising:
3 a memory, wherein the memory is operable to store document data from an
4 application, the document data comprising data for printing at least a portion of the document;
5 and
6 a processor coupled to the memory, the processor operable to:
7 access information associated with a sender of the document data, and
8 format a page to be printed such that the page comprises at least a portion
9 of the document data and the accessed information, and the accessed information is located
10 outside document data areas and inside printer allowable margins,
11 wherein formatting the page to be printed comprises checking whether the accessed
12 information for the formatted page fits between the document data areas and the printer
13 allowable margins.

1 22. The article of claim 25 wherein the instructions are further operable to cause one
2 or more machines to perform operations comprising:
3 receiving a request to format the information associated with the sender of document
4 data, wherein the request is responsive to the alert; and
5 generating a user interface that allows formatting of the information associated with the
6 sender of document data.

1 23. The article of claim 24 wherein the user interface allows specification of the
2 content and appearance of the information associated with the sender of document data.

1 24. An article of manufacture comprising a machine-readable medium that stores
2 instructions operable to cause one or more machines to perform operations comprising:
3 determining whether document data from an application has been received, the document
4 data comprising data for printing at least a portion of the document;
5 accessing information associated with a sender of the document data; and
6 formatting a page to be printed such that the page comprises at least a portion of the
7 received document data and the accessed information, and the accessed information is located
8 outside document data areas and inside printer allowable margins,
9 wherein formatting the page to be printed comprises checking whether the accessed
10 information for the formatted page fits between the document data areas and the printer
11 allowable margins.

1 25. The article of claim 24 wherein the instructions are further operable to cause one
2 or more machines to perform operations comprising initiating an alert that the accessed
3 information for the formatted page does not fit between the document data areas and the printer
4 allowable margins.

1 26. The article of claim 25 wherein the instructions are further operable to cause one
2 or more machines to perform operations comprising allowing the format of the accessed
3 information for the formatted page to be changed.

1 27. The article of claim 24 wherein the instructions are further operable to cause one
2 or more machines to perform operations comprising associating the received document data with
3 the sender of the document data.

1 28. The article of claim 24 wherein accessing the information associated with the
2 sender of document data comprises accessing information identifying the sender.

1 31. A system comprising:
2 memory for storing document data received from an application, the document data
3 comprising data for printing at least a portion of the document, and
4 means for accessing information associated with a sender of the document data, and
5 formatting a page to be printed such that the page comprises at least a portion of the document
6 data and the accessed information, and the accessed information is located outside document data
7 areas and inside printer allowable margins,
8 wherein formatting the page to be printed comprises checking whether the accessed
9 information for the formatted page fits between the document data areas and the printer
10 allowable margins.

1 32. The system of claim 31 wherein formatting the page to be printed comprises
2 initiating an alert if the accessed information for the formatted page does not fit between the
3 document data areas and the printer allowable margins.

1 33. A computer-implemented method for printing a document, the method
2 comprising:
3 receiving document data from an application that facilitates displaying and editing the
4 document, the document data comprising data for printing at least a portion of the document;
5 determining an identifier associated with a sender of the document data;
6 accessing information associated with the sender identifier, including querying a database
7 comprising sender associated information;
8 formatting a page to be printed such that the page comprises at least a portion of the
9 received document data and the accessed information, and the accessed information is located
10 outside document data areas and inside printer allowable margins;
11 checking whether the accessed information for the formatted page fits between the
12 document data areas and the printer allowable margins;
13 initiating an alert if the accessed information for the formatted page does not fit between
14 the document data areas and the printer allowable margins;
15 generating a user interface that allows formatting of content, location, orientation, and
16 appearance of information associated with a sender; and
17 generating a printer message comprising the formatted page.

1 34. The method of claim 7, wherein the application facilitates displaying and editing
2 the document.

1 35. The system of claim 20, wherein the application facilitates displaying and editing
2 the document.

1 36. The article of claim 24, wherein the application facilitates displaying and editing
2 the document.

1 37. The system of claim 31, wherein the application facilitates displaying and editing
2 the document.

1 38. The method of claim 7, wherein the accessed information comprises information
2 identifying the sender.

IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None.

X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None.